

May 15, 1973

why we should discriminate against any section in Nebraska or any section of the city. We have many fine independent banks in the State of Nebraska. They perform a valuable service to their customers. The State of Nebraska has grown and progressed because we have these banks. We need continued progress and development in banking. All other sections of industry, agriculture and business are allowed to grow and expand, to meet the needs of their customers. There is no reason why banking should be discriminated against. Even in the area of finance. We find institutions that are allowed to branch, to expand their services to their customers, to provide for a better service to their customers and therefore I feel that the banks should be allowed to do the same. As a city grows, new, old customers move into a new area of a city. There is no reason why the customer of a bank would have to drive miles across the city in order to do business with his own bank. There are many instances where customers today, reside 4 or 5, 6, 7, miles from the area where they previously lived and if they have to drive across town, it creates additional traffic congestion and costs money, costs money to the customer, costs money eventually to the bank. I think that if you would take a long look at the facility type bill we passed, you would have to agree that there is no favoritism for one bank over another. One of the opponents of the bill told me, that an amendment proposed by him, suggested by the governor, which was discussed on the floor, would satisfy 98% of the banks in the State of Nebraska. Now I would like to ask the members of this body, if the bill is good for 98% of the banks, why isn't good for 100% of the banks. There is no reason to discriminate against the bank because of location or because of size. I feel and I feel very strongly, that the banking industry does not need additional banks in many cases, but we need stronger banks. We need banks that can meet the credit and needs of their customers and credit needs of their consumers and credit needs of their community. I know that, that there has been some comment and considerable a, comment that this is a step toward branch banking. I would suggest to you that if you will read the Governor's veto message carefully and I'm sure you have, if you will study the news release which preceded his veto message, you will have to conceive that he accepts the concept that is embodied in LB 312. He accepts the idea that we need additional teller facilities. He accepts the idea that additional teller facilities is not branch banking. Now I suggest and I would, and I think I have many people who would agree with me, that if you can have a teller facility within 3 miles, then another teller facility within the city limits, is not a step toward branch banking. It is simply a step toward improved service to customers and that is what we should be concerned with. All of us in here, are businessmen, farmers, teachers, lawyers, professional people,

(END OF BELT #1)